REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claim Status

Claims 1, 3, 4, 7, 8 and 11 are pending. Claims 1 and 11 are currently amended. Claims 5, 6, 9 and 10 were previously canceled without prejudice and claim 2 is currently canceled without prejudice. Claim 1 is amended pursuant to [0013], [0023] and [0041] for component (A-1); [0024], [0041] and claim 2 for component (B); [0025] for component (C); [0026] for component (D); and [0034]-[0035] for component (G). Claim 11 is amended pursuant to [0037]. No new matter is believed to have been entered.

§103(a) Rejections

Claims 1-3, 7, 8 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious in view of the combination of *Laughner '154* (US 5,369,154), *Laughner '686* (US 4,786,686) and *Meyer* (US 2004/0030090). Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious in view of the combination of *Laughner '154* (US 5,369,154), *Laughner '686* (US 4,786,686), *Meyer* (US 2004/0030090) and *Paul* (US 4,569,970). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

The Office again asserts that the claimed polycarbonate resin composition is rendered obvious by varying combinations of the cited references due to the fact that all of the components of the claimed resin are taught when the references are taken in combination.

For ease of discussion, each of the components of the claimed composition of claim 1 will be addressed separately at first, and then as a combination second.

With respect to component (A-1), Applicants note that the Office looks to *Laughner '154*. However, *Laughner '154* discloses a polycarbonate resin having a molecular weight of about 9,500 (see col. 17, lines 55-57) that does not disclose or suggest the claimed polycarbonate resin (A-1) having a viscosity average molecular weight of 15,000 to 20,000. Nonetheless, Applicants point out that *Meyer* discloses a co-polycarbonate which contains 14.1 mol% of dihydroxybiphenyl (see e.g., Example 11). This 14.1 mol% of *Meyer* equates

to 30 mol% with respect to the total amount of divalent phenol as a raw material in the formation of the aromatic polycarbonate resin. Applicants (A-1) claims 5-30 mol% (see claim 1).

While *Meyer* may disclose 30 mol%, one skilled in the art would have no motivation to look to mol %s below 30 mol% from the disclosure of *Meyer* as a whole. Furthermore, courts have held that where, as here, the prior art disclosure suggests the outer limits of the range of suitable values, and that the optimum resides within that range, and where there are indications elsewhere that in fact the optimum should be sought within that range, the determination of optimum values outside that range may not be obvious (In re Sebek, 465 F.2d 902, 175 USPQ 93, 95 (CCPA 1972)). Thus, without any motivation to consider mol %s below 30 mol%, Applicants' claimed range of 5-30% is not rendered obvious by *Meyer*.

Regarding component (B), the Office again looks to *Laughner '154*. However, Applicants note that *Laughner '154* discloses a composition of matter comprising 5-95% polycarbonate and up to about 50% rubber-modified styrene/acrylonitrile copolymer (col. 2, lines 23-49, and claim 1; see also, col. 16, line 47, to col. 17, line 5). Applicants claimed component (B) recites "wherein the amorphous styrene resin of said component (B) is not rubber modified ..." (see claim 1). Accordingly, the rubber-modified AS resin of *Laughner '154* does not disclose or suggest the non-rubber-modified AS and/or MS resin as claimed.

Concerning component (C), the Office yet again looks to *Laughner '154*. However, Applicants not the *Laughner '154* is silent on the particle size of the talc that is disclosed as a potential filler. Accordingly, not only does such silence not disclose or suggest that particle size is of consequence to the resulting composition, but such silence surely does not disclose or suggest a desire to limit the particle size to 0.1-20 μm as claimed.

With regards to component (D), the Office looks to *Laughner '154*. Laughner ' 154 discloses that other impact modifiers such as a core-shell graft copolymer can be added to the

compositions in an amount of up to 25%, preferably 1-15%, and more preferably less than 5% (col. 2, lines 50-57). The claimed invention recites the inclusion of a core-shell elastomer (D) "in an amount of 3 to 10 parts by mass" (see claim 1).

While *Laughner '154* may disclose up to 25% of a core-shell graft copolymer, one skilled in the art would have no motivation to look to amounts above 5% due to *Laughner '154's* teaching that 1-15% is preferable and less than 5% is even more preferable. Accordingly, *Laughner '154* teaches that the low end (i.e., less than 5%) of a range up to 25% is optimal. Furthermore, courts have held that where, as here, the prior art disclosure suggests the outer limits of the range of suitable values, and that the optimum resides within that range, and where there are indications elsewhere that in fact the optimum should be sought within that range, the determination of optimum values outside that range may not be obvious (In re Sebek, 465 F.2d 902, 175 USPQ 93, 95 (CCPA 1972)). Thus, without any motivation to consider amounts above 5%, Applicants' claimed range of 3-10% is not rendered obvious by *Laughner '154*.

Lastly, the Office looks to *Laughner '686* regarding claimed component (G). *Laughner '686* discloses a flame retardant, impact resistant aromatic carbonate polymer composition containing 0.01-10 wt% of a fluorine-containing polymer of the fibril forming type (claim 1). However, *Laughner '686* is silent with respect to the molecular weight of such fluorine-containing polymers and is also silent on their classification in accordance with the ASTM Standard. Accordingly, not only does such silence not disclose or suggest that the molecular weight and/or classification is of consequence to the resulting composition, but such silence surely does not disclose or suggest a desire to limit the molecular weight to 500,000-10,000,000 and/or to limit the fluorine-containing polymers to those classified as Type 3 as claimed.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that the *combination* of the cited references fails to disclose or suggest the claimed invention for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to the individual components because the combination fails to fulfill the deficiencies of the individual references. In other words, the combination of the cited references fails to render obvious the claimed invention for at least the following deficiencies: (i) failure to disclose or suggest the aromatic polycarbonate resin (A-1) having a viscosity average molecular weight of 15,000-20,000 wherein dihydroxybiphenyl is used in an amount of 5-30 mol%, (ii) failure to disclose or suggest the amorphous styrene resin of said component (B) being not rubber-modified and being AS and/or MS resin, (iii) failure to disclose or suggest the talc (C) having an average particle diameter of 0.1-20 μm, (iv) failure to disclose or suggest the core-shell elastomer (D) in an amount of 3-10 parts by mass, and (v) failure to disclose or suggest the polytetrafluoroethylene (G) having an average molecular weight of 500,000-10,000,000, being capable of forming fibrils, and being classified Type 3.

Accordingly, as no combination of the cited references discloses or suggests each of the claimed limitations, no combination of the cited references renders obvious the claimed invention. As such, Applicants request withdrawal of the obviousness rejections of record.

Conclusion

For the reasons discussed above, Applicants submit that all now-pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejections and passage of this case to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
Norman F. Oblon

Justine M. Wilbur
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 59,678

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/07)